

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 1, 7-8, 14-15, and 21 have been amended to more properly define preexisting claim limitations and are supported by the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,910 of DeJager (“DeJager”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Specifically, claim 1 as amended includes the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

parsing a message received by a communication device to extract an incomplete addressing datum; and
searching for at least one clue from the parsed message to complete the incomplete addressing datum.
(Applicants’ Independent Claim 1).

In contrast, DeJager fails to disclose parsing a message received by a communication device to extract an incomplete addressing datum. According to DeJager, the system merely receives the calling and called party numbers (DeJager, col. 3, lines 39; col. 4, lines 7-10; Fig. 4, box 401). Therefore, DeJager fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 8 and 15 as amended are not anticipated by DeJager for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, and thus, claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are not anticipated by DeJager for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claim 3 sets forth that the incomplete addressing datum is a partial email address. In contrast, DeJager fails to disclose that the incomplete addressing datum is a partial email address. According to DeJager, the telephone set or the PC merely receives a calling and/or a called party number, such as a 800 or a 900 number (DeJager, col. 3, lines 39; col. 4, lines 7-10; Fig. 4, box 401). DeJager does not disclose or suggest that the incomplete addressing datum is a partial email address. Therefore, DeJager fails to anticipate claim 3 for this additional reason as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claims 10 and 17 are not anticipated by DeJager for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 3. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call C. Teresa Wong at (408) 720-8300, x377.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 29, 2004



Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300